HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 35 Wednesday, September 2, 1959 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

LABOR BILL: *Kennedy's plight* ..... (page 1)
INFLATION: *Democrats stoke the fire* ..... (page 2)
ROCKEFELLER: *Polls rock Rocky* ..... (page 2)
EDUCATION: *Figures don't lie, but* ..... (page 3)
STRIKE: *News from North Carolina* ..... (page 3)

After the Great Victory: The astonishing triumph of the conservatives in passing the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House two weeks ago has had truly seismic effects on Capitol Hill and the country. Whatever is the final word of the whole Congress and the assessment of this year's fight for labor reform—two developments are now discernible, to sharper eyes among politicians, as possessing far-reaching effects.

(1) On August 21, leaders of the Democratic party in New York, headed by State Chairman Michael Prendergast, decided to back Mayor Wagner for the nomination for Vice President. This happened, significantly, right after Senator John F. Kennedy had been rebuffed by the House passage of a tough labor bill. The public in general did not perceive it, but all politicos recognized this for what it was: the New York Democrats had cut the throat of Presidential hopeful Kennedy.

For this meant that these Democratic leaders would send to the Democratic nominating convention next year in Los Angeles a delegation which would not back Senator Kennedy. For Kennedy is a Catholic; so is Wagner. Obviously, the New York delegation (as well as any other delegation) would not back a Catholic for the No. 1 post (to which Kennedy aspires) and at the same time be pledged to support a Catholic (Wagner) for the No. 2, Vice Presidential position.

New York's delegation to the convention will be the most numerous and powerful of all state delegations. The second largest delegation, California, obviously will be pledged at the outset to Governor Pat Brown, also a Catholic.

Q.E.D.—as New York politicians put it—Senator Kennedy's fight for the Presidential candidature has now met a spectacular, if not fatal, reverse.

On Capitol Hill, Senators talk much about the sharp slump in Kennedy's chances, after the New York Democratic party's move. Additionally, they stress how "Little Jack" is handicapped by what one Senator called "the all-or-nothing stubbornness" of the labor bosses. "Jack's damned if he does, damned if he don't. If he supports a 'tough bill,' Reuther and his crowd may veto him at the convention. If he succeeds in getting some compromises in favor of unions, he'll have to accept some tough provisions because the public wants these. Yet, the stubborn labor bosses won't like him for that either."

(2) Tremendous pressure from out in the country on Senators to pass the Landrum-Griffin bill has continued, and this has been fueled not only by the inspiring vote for the bill in the House but also by mounting indignation at the arrogance of the labor bosses. More information about the shameless lobbying of the labor crowd in the halls of Congress and surrounding hotels where members live, has gotten out to the grass roots. In addition to threats, liquor, women, high denomination currency—offered to and spurned by members—have fed a great moral reaction.

Finally, James B. Carey, President of the Electrical Workers Union and a wheel horse of the AFL-CIO, in an extraordinary letter on August 18, threatened those members who voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill with retaliation by labor at the next election. The revulsion of the public was instantaneous and House members who received the letter ran off 250,000 copies which they mailed to constituents. While the AFL-CIO Council thundered of reprisals and even greater slush funds to beat those who voted for labor reform, public temperature rose further.

As a result, in many corners of Capitol Hill, members predict that next January, when Congress reassembles, a great campaign will be launched to pass laws curtailing the labor boss misuse of union funds for political purposes and for harnessing the monopoly position of labor union power in the country.

Front Organizations: One of the nightmares which haunt Government planners' minds in connection with the famous visit is the possible appearance of so-called "liberal" groups or "letterhead" committees urging appeasement of the journeying dictator. The clandestine "leadership" meetings of Commie members in key cities (cited in last week's news section) may lead to the establishment of these "committees." Such a consequence would scarcely please those diplomats who have to engage in bargaining with their Soviet opposite numbers.

However, no member of Congress will dare raise his voice in the exact words of the "villain" in Allan Drury's best-selling novel about Washington, *Advise and Consent* (Doubleday, $5.75). This character, "Senator Van Ackerman of Wyoming" harangues a mass meeting sponsored by the appeasement "Committee on Making Further Offers for a Russian Truce," called "COMFORT." He gives them the line: "As for me, I had rather crawl on my knees to Moscow than die under an atom bomb!"

(Drury, presently on the *New York Times* staff in the Capital, gives a vivid description of contemporary Washington, with fictionalized reporting on the true ways and wiles of politicos, in the Executive, Judiciary and Legislative branches of Government. This book is the literary sensation of the Capital today.)

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Inflation Front: The Democrats in the House Ways and Means Committee on August 25 threw an extra shovelful on the fires of inflation by refusing to remove the 4¼ per cent ceiling on the interest rate of Federal Government bonds—which the Treasury, the Federal Reserve Board and many others have been urging for some time. This action by the Democratic leaders badly hampers the fight against inflation. The President denounced the Democrats' failure to lift the rate saying: "No issue of greater importance has come before this session of Congress."

Secretary of the Treasury Anderson remarked last week, "Nothing shoots up interest rates as fast as fear of inflation. That's one reason rates rose so fast in the summer of 1958. Investors are understandably reluctant to tie up their funds in long-term bonds if they believe the value of the dollar will go down.

"If they become convinced that we'll protect the value of the dollar, partly through sound debt management, they'll be more likely to buy long-term bonds at lower interest rates."

At the same time, President George Meany of the AFL-CIO did his bit for the forces of inflation. He said last week that the President's crusade against inflation is simply "hysteria" and that the President, plus big business, is trying to "brainwash" the country with warnings about fiscal solvency and balanced Budget. "We must protest," said Meany and his Council, "against the politically motivated hysteria which this Administration and its big business allies have instigated."

Capitol Hill finds justification for public concern over the recent report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics which showed that for the fourth consecutive month, the national cost-of-living index reached a new record high.

Khrushchev Visit: Not much is being said by White House and State Department sources, but observers believe that the "high level" of Government is worried, not so much about protecting the visitor's security, as about his reaction to the coolness of the people towards him. Thus, it is noted, Governor Herschel C. Loveless of Iowa told the press on August 22 that he was opposed to the Soviet Premier's visit. He said he opposed Khrushchev's visit because he feared it would be used for propaganda purposes. He said he has no plans to greet the visitor. Loveless is a "liberal" Democrat, and those who know him believe that he wants to run for the Senate and fears a show of cordiality might lose him votes. Iowa is on the official itinerary of the tour. Chicago and Detroit, originally mentioned as points to be visited, have been dropped. Few deny that the temper of people in those cities strongly suggested that they should be omitted from the itinerary.

● The AFL-CIO Executive Council, in a statement concerning the visit of the Russian ruler, said last week it "cannot give recognition to the head of a Government which does not permit its own workers to have any free trade unions" and "which seeks to destroy human freedom in any form." President George Meany, speaking for the 27-man Council, said the AFL-CIO would "reject out of hand" any suggestion that the labor federation invite Khrushchev to its coming convention in San Francisco (a city on his itinerary).

It is understood that Walter Reuther and James B. Carey, of the Council, believe that they should see Khrushchev personally and tell him "straight from the shoulder" that the trade union members of America will not be deluded by any Communist propaganda.

There is little doubt that the AFL-CIO Council's official position to ignore the visiting Russian springs in large part from the knowledge that their rank-and-file members oppose the visit of Khrushchev and want to give him the "civil but silent" treatment.

On Capitol Hill, observers remark: "Now big labor has taken an official position. What position will big business take?"

The Wedding: The fine Madison Avenue hand of Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, left-wing Democrat and official in the Truman Administration, appears behind the hoopla over the marriage of Governor Rockefeller's son Steven to a Norwegian grocer's daughter. Mrs. Rosenberg is public relations advisor to the Rockefeller Brothers.

Public relations circles recall similar handling of the wedding of Sara Delano Roosevelt, daughter of Congressman James Roosevelt, who was adopted by John Hay Whitney when her mother—the former Betty Cushing—divorced FDR's eldest son and married Whitney.

Sara married an Italian-American barber in 1953. At that time Anna Rosenberg was working for the multi-millionaire Whitneys to depict them as "true friends of the common people." The generous coverage of that Cinderella wedding did no harm to Mrs. Rosenberg's business. The recent headline and picture splash of the Rockefeller nuptials in Norway added lustre to the Rosenberg name along Madison Avenue, although the girl's parents were a bit dismayed over the huge press delegation that descended upon their small village. Far from dismayed is Presidential hopeful Nelson Rockefeller. In the public relations trade "fairy tale" marriages are valued for their "humanizing effect" on the public's image of the rich and prominent parties involved.

Polls: Nelson Rockefeller's abrupt about-face on his nomination strategy barely saved him from becoming the political laughingstock of 1959. On the heels of his forced repudiation of popularity polls as the basis for deciding whether to run, polls from two sources not unfriendly to Rockefeller show him losing support, and make mincemeat of the claim that only the Governor can get the independent votes and win.

The August Gallup Poll indicated Vice President Richard Nixon's continued upsurge in popularity; the Vice President was favored by 65 per cent of GOP voters and 45 per cent of independents, while Rockefeller barely held his own with Republicans and lost ground in his supposed stronghold, the independents.

Another poll which received less national attention, however, is given more significance in Washington. The Boston *Herald*, a generally "liberal" newspaper, reports that a survey in New Hampshire, where the first primary will be held next year, shows Nixon even more popular in the Granite State than nationally, getting a whopping

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

74 per cent of the GOP support to Rockefeller's 11 per cent. And New Hampshire's independent voters supply the clincher: not only do a majority of them favor Nixon, but Rockefeller is not even second choice—he received less support (13 per cent as against 16) than UN Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge!

Sherman Adams Again: News comes that the former top secretary of Sherman Adams (when he was Assistant President) is now Governor Nelson Rockefeller's personal secretary in Albany. She is Miss Ilene Slater and she joined the Rockefeller forces during Nelson's campaign for the governorship. When he went to Albany, she was appointed personal secretary.

The Manchester (New Hampshire) *Union Leader's* state capital correspondent, D. Frank O'Neil, warns against "jumping to a hasty conclusion" that Miss Slater is "just another secretary." She was chosen to join the Rockefeller organization as one with a "knowledge of national affairs, nationally known personalities and national impact." Obviously, this included her experience at the White House as a top secretary in the Eisenhower inner circle. Miss Slater left the White House before the exposé of Sherman Adams and Goldfine commenced.

The Union Leader *correspondent suggests that if Rockefeller and Nixon (who was not exactly friendly with Adams) lock horns in open conflict, "the stage is certainly set for a close liaison operation between Rockefeller and Adams, through the secretary who has served both men."*

On June 10, HUMAN EVENTS reported that "Adams has been quietly busy promoting the Rockefeller candidature in the Granite State." Not surprisingly, Adams, the fountainhead of Modern Republicanism, finds the "liberal" Rockefeller much to his taste.

Castro's Cuba: Red Cuba is getting redder—and the American people will turn purple when they realize the part their own Government has played in letting Cuba go Communist.

...Willard Edwards, top reporter for *The Chicago Tribune*, writes that two Senators have taken evidence in Miami on communism in Cuba. The evidence was described as "exhaustive and staggering." Open hearings are being urged by one Senator; they would show, he said, that Russia is establishing bases in the Carribean a few miles from Florida—as reported in HUMAN EVENTS on July 29. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee will probably make the evidence public after Khrushchev's visit to the US.

Capital observers add this report to stories in many papers recently describing the Red-dominated training camps in Cuba where attacks on neighboring countries are planned, to the testimony of Major Pedro Diaz Lanz and the ousting of President Manuel Urrutia—and they wonder: What more evidence does the State Department need? And, what will happen in 1960 when the Democrats, pointing to Cuba and Khrushchev's visit, charge the GOP with being "soft" on communism?

Education: The Department of Health, Education and Welfare began its annual snow job on the public this week by releasing figures purporting to show that America is beset by an enormous teacher shortage.

The Department's August 30, 1959, release on teacher shortages lists the number of qualified teachers available during the 1958-59 school year at 1,400,700. This is about 65,000 more than the advance estimate issued in August, 1958, when the Department claimed a 132,000 teacher shortage would develop.

Over the last few years the record shows advance estimates such as this have placed the number of qualified teachers between 55,000 and 72,000 lower than the number reported a year later. Now for the coming year the Department claims that 1,563,000 teachers will be needed and there will be only 1,368,000 qualified. Educational observers predict next year's figures will show the current estimate to be far off just as were those for 1958-59 and previous years.

This ruse is pulled off by figure juggling—writing off teachers who move, take maternity leave, etc., and is used to propagandize Federal aid to education legislation such as the Administration-opposed $4.4 billion Murray-Metcalf bill.

Textile Workers: The tide of battle shifts from week to week as the labor bosses continue in their efforts to "take over" in the key southern state of North Carolina. (1) A controversial ruling by the North Carolina Employment Security Commission has strengthened the "bargaining" power of union members in the state. At stake was a state law which reduces from 16 to twelve weeks the period of unemployment benefits for jobless persons when such persons refuse suitable work without good cause. Involved were twelve members of the Textile Workers Union of America who declined to return to their jobs at the strike-bound Harriet-Henderson Cotton Mills when the mills resumed operations with both new and old workers last May after a six-month shut-down.

At that time, strikers who did not return to Harriet-Henderson began drawing unemployment benefits. After twelve weeks, however, the state cut off the payments since the recipients had suitable work at their disposal. But twelve textile workers in this group appealed to the Employment Security Commission for four more weeks of unemployment compensation.

Last week, D. G. Ball, the commission's special appeals deputy, decided the case in the strikers' favor, explaining: "The claimants being union members felt that they were morally obligated to remain on strike with the other members and did not wish to work without a contract. Therefore, they did not cross the picket lines to resume their duties."

Many North Carolina taxpayers are wondering if the state isn't morally obligated to be more frugal in the spending of their money.

(2) On the other hand, North Carolinians recently moved swiftly to bring to justice labor bosses and goons who planned violence in Henderson. A Superior Court jury found eight members of the TWUA guilty of con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spiring to blow up a transformer station adjacent to the cotton mills (see HUMAN EVENTS for June 24, 1959).

Judge Raymond Mallard sentenced three ring-leaders to prison terms of from six to ten years; the others received two to seven year sentences.

"I hope all of you gentlemen will some day come to understand," Judge Mallard told the guilty unionists, "that the law is bigger than you, bigger than the union, bigger than any organization. The people of North Carolina will not tolerate anyone holding themselves above the law."

Protest Can Be Potent: Americans have perhaps forgotten that the British had a visit from Khrushchev in April, 1956. From British sources, HUMAN EVENTS can offer a picture of how the British people handled the matter (which, in its initial stages, has some parallel with what Americans are beginning to do now).

First of all, a period of "cultural exchanges" went on between Britain and Russia, and from Moscow, Khrushchev sought to impress Britons in exclusive interviews with his lack of knowledge of the sceptred isle and his desire to see it. Then Malenkov took a trip to London and broke the ice. No substantial objection arose among the British to Malenkov's visit, no more than arose in the US when Mikoyan came here. However, refugee groups and small groups of active anti-Communists raised their voices against Khrushchev's plans to come to England. These were minimized in the press and there were references to "fanatics."

But letters, resolutions, petitions and public discussion swelled and expanded far beyond these initial small groups. As this process mounted, the anti-Khrushchev tide increased and became "respectable." Politicians hastened to give assurance of "no sell-out."

Highpoints were, as follows: a mass meeting in the Manchester Free Trade Hall on March 25, led by Malcolm Muggeridge, prominent editor; a debate in the House of Lords after a speech by the Duke of Norfolk, on March 28; a day of prayer launched by Cardinal Griffin on April 8; the Duke of Norfolk and the Catholic Union got from Prime Minister Eden a pledge not to violate principles in dealing with Khrushchev. Massive petitions of protest against the visit enlisted about 180,000 refugees and over 250,000 British citizens. Placards, arm bands, mourning and other devices were used, but stress was on prayer, non-participation and discussion. The appeal was to emotion, to intellect and to conscience.

When Khrushchev and Bulganin arrived at Portsmouth on April 19, 1956, they were met by the First Lord of the Admiralty and the Minister of State. (Bulganin was then Premier, Khrushchev head of the Communist party.) The Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister awaited them in London. They were received once by the Queen, briefly, at Windsor. This was the protocol—Bulganin was received as chief of Government, not as head of state as Khrushchev (although Premier) will be received in Washington.

Publicly, the reception was generally quiet, with, however, a few pickets and demonstrators arrested. Crowds were curious, but quiet and undemonstrative and diminishingly small. When the visitors reached Oxford, students sang "Good Old Joe," to the tune of "The Volga Boatman" (a ribbing in view of Khrushchev's then recent repudiation of Stalin). The crowds became quieter and smaller and by April 23, when a new petition with 60,000 signatures was filed by Muggeridge, citizens in the churches and at protest meetings far exceeded turnouts for Khrushchev.

All these chilly evidences, plus talk of captive nations, brought angry reaction from Khrushchev, who engaged in a verbal altercation with British Labor leaders at a dinner, when they petitioned him to release from prison Social Democrats in Eastern Europe. He shouted them down as "enemies of the people."

After the Russians departed, the *London Economist* described the experience as "Ten Days That Failed to Shake the World."

Fulton Lewis: Many subscribers have written to HUMAN EVENTS asking why radio commentator Fulton Lewis, Jr., is off the air in various areas of the country. Lewis' office informs HUMAN EVENTS that he has been off the air in Los Angeles, Seattle, Oklahoma and the New England states because the Mutual Network on which he broadcasts has lost its stations in those areas. The Mutual Broadcasting System expects soon to sign up replacement stations.

The process of obtaining a replacement station in Los Angeles has encountered one big difficulty—organized labor. In that city one of the best stations, now independent, was about to sign up with Mutual when it discovered that a network station in the Los Angeles area would be required by the unions to pay $95,000 in additional wages to already well paid union-scale employees.

REV. PAUL BECKWITH, evangelist and Bible teacher, Lansing, Mich.: "In these days when so much radio and newspaper comment is slanted 'left of center,' it is refreshing to pick up HUMAN EVENTS and find the true inside story from a conservative standpoint. I hope it will have an ever widening circle of influence. I use it constantly for reference material in an itinerant preaching ministry."

WARREN Y. GORE, Department of Speech, Illinois Institute of Technology: "HUMAN EVENTS provides an opportunity for our staff and students to read both news and special articles written by intelligent, moderate writers and commentators on a wide variety of political issues and historical events."

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In lots of 5000 $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 volumes available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT, NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, GEORGE O. FOWLER

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 35 HUMAN EVENTS September 2, 1959

Article Section

The Danger of Playing Host to Khrushchev

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

By SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD OF CONNECTICUT

NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV first appears in history as a Communist official in the Ukraine in the early 1930's helping to direct the program of planned starvation which resulted in the death of five million Ukranians.

In 1938 Khrushchev was appointed Communist chief in the Ukraine. He was appointed to that position as a reward for his previous ruthlessness. His task was to direct the great Ukrainian purge of that year. Authorities on Ukrainian history estimate that 400,000 men, women and children were murdered under Khrushchev's over-all direction in that single year.

Perhaps a fully documented account of the purge in one of the districts of the Ukraine will give a graphic picture.

Three months after Khrushchev rose to power in the Ukraine, twelve thousand people were murdered in the small city of Vinnitsa; each of the victims was shot in the back of the neck—in some cases two or three times. They were thrown into mass graves. Their fate was unknown to their families and townspeople until the graves were accidentally discovered several years later.

The documentation on Vinnitsa is complete with hundreds of photographs, reliable details of eyewitness accounts and authoritative medical records. This is what Khrushchev did in one city. The atrocities of Vinnitsa were repeated throughout the Ukraine.

He continued to rise in Communist ranks through his participation in other purges in the Ukraine right up to the German conquest of that area in 1941.

Following the war, he was sent back by Stalin to direct the crushing of the resistance of the Ukrainian people to the reimposition of Communist rule.

We have lived in an era of totalitarian regimes, regimes which have perpetrated crimes on so gigantic a scale that people cannot comprehend them, crimes so often repeated that our sensibilities become fatigued and our reaction dulled. Many who would be shocked by an individual murder in their home town have come to accept the organized annihilation of distant millions as a fact of twentieth century life. And when these crimes are obscured by the passage of 20 years, many cease to respond altogether.

If there are those who feel that the mass murder of thousands of human beings loses its relevance after the passage of 20 years, I would point out Khrushchev's role in the massacre of the Hungarian patriots in 1956.

It was Khrushchev who in 1956 ordered the Red Army to invade Hungary, depose the legal Government of Imre Nagy and ruthlessly massacre Hungarian civilians in all areas where there was open opposition. It was Khrushchev who invited the Hungarian commanding officer, General Pal Maleter, to negotiations under flag of truce—and then had him arrested by the Chief of the Soviet Secret Police, General Serov. It was Khrushchev who lured Premier Imre Nagy and his colleagues out of their sanctuary in the Yugoslav embassy by perfidiously offering them an assurance of safe conduct—and then kidnapped them as they emerged from the embassy.

It was Khrushchev who one year ago horrified the conscience of the free world by ordering the murder of General Maleter and Prime Minister Nagy after secret trials on fraudulent charges.

Nikita Khrushchev rose to Communist prominence as the Hangman of the Ukraine.

He has maintained himself in power as the Butcher of Budapest.

He has on his hands the blood of countless thousands of innocent people who were murdered under his personal direction.

He is responsible for the continued suffering of millions in slave labor camps.

He is the principal world spokesman for the ruthless attack on religion under which Cardinal Mindszenty, Archbishop Beran and countless other churchmen of various faiths have been persecuted.

He is the sponsor of the dreadful persecution of Jews within the Communist empire which, according to the American Jewish Committee, threatens "the extinction of the Jewish religion and culture in a vast region of the earth."

He maintains the iron grip of tyranny over a dozen captive peoples.

In addition to his personal crimes he is the principal representative of the system of concentration camps, mass murder, brainwashing, militant atheism,

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the organized promotion of falsehood, and the planned enslavement of the entire non-Communist world.

This is the man whom the President has invited to our country as an honored guest. This is the man to whom we are asked to extend all of our courtesies, our kindnesses, our tokens of honor and esteem, our symbols of approval.

To those who deny that a state visit by Khrushchev implies approval for Khrushchev by our Government and people, let me point out what is involved in such a visit.

If we may assume that the normal customs observed during state visits will be followed with respect to Khrushchev, we shall be treated to a series of strange spectacles, each more repugnant than the one before.

He will undoubtedly receive a series of official greetings surpassing anything previous in our history. As the hysteria heightens, it is probable that from one end of this country to the other he will be embraced, deferred to, flattered and fawned upon by our highest officials.

On television and in the press we and the world will be treated to a continuing parade of pictures of American leaders, and American people in friendly, approving, back-slapping poses with the Red dictator.

All the media of public communications will be open to him presenting him with the opportunity for a propaganda victory which must be beyond the wildest dreams of the Kremlin.

WHAT WOULD THE COUNTRY have thought if in 1939 President Roosevelt had invited Adolf Hitler to a barnstorming tour of the United States, fresh from his conquest of Czechoslovakia, Austria and Poland and in the midst of his extermination of millions of Jews. Would the members of this body have tolerated the hanging of swastikas in the center of our Capitol? Can we imagine Hitler in the White House? Yet, the Khrushchev visit amounts to exactly the same thing.

Between Hitler and Khrushchev, there is nothing to choose. The hammer and sickle emblem is no less offensive than the swastika.

The only thing that has changed is the attitude of the American Government. Over the years there must have been an imperceptible erosion of moral consciousness, an erosion which is suddenly revealed by an incident of this kind.

The Communist propaganda machine will exploit to the fullest advantage everything that comes out of the Khrushchev tour of the United States. We can be certain that the satellite peoples, who still cling to the hope of liberty, will be flooded with photographs of Khrushchev being wined and dined, flattered and applauded by the leaders and people of our country. To the satellite peoples, Khrushchev's visit to the United States will be interpreted as a reflection of American acceptance of permanent Soviet domination of their lands.

Another immediate result of the visit will be the upgrading of Khrushchev at home. Since the death of Stalin, no successor to him has reached the pinnacle of supreme and uncontested power that he exercised. There has been a power struggle going on within the Kremlin since the death of Stalin. Occasionally there comes to light an event which gives us a rare glimpse of this conflict, such as the murder of Beria, the downgrading of Bulganin, or the exile of Molotov.

Khrushchev has thus far been the victor and is apparently moving steadily toward complete one-man domination. While this power struggle continues, and particularly if it should erupt more violently, the Communist regime is weakened to the corresponding advantage of the free world.

It is in our interest to prevent Khrushchev from attaining the undisputed control which Stalin exercised. It is in our interest that there be a continuation of whatever divisive, internecine conflicts now exist within the Kremlin. Therefore, anything that we do to promote Khrushchev, to increase his stature among his potential rivals, to build him up before the people of the Soviet Union is to our own grave disadvantage.

It is generally accepted that the shift toward a "soft policy" on Berlin started with the visit to Khrushchev by Prime Minister Macmillan of Great Britain. Now, for the first time in the cold war, the leaders of Russia and the United States will be negotiating alone.

Khrushchev will do everything in his power to split the principal members of the free world alliance. Each of these Governments must contend at home with a political opposition which can be counted on to exploit any indication that the United States and Russia are rearranging world affairs. The President may succeed in temporarily allaying the misgivings of our chief allies but the danger of a beginning of distrust, suspicion and division is a serious possibility.

Those who have been soft on communism will grow softer. Those who are unconcerned about the Communist menace will become even more indifferent. Those who have been sounding the alarms will find their difficulties multiplied. Those in the world who understand the nature of communism and who have looked to the United States as the citadel of resistance will become further discouraged.

Advocates of the Khrushchev visit have advanced a number of reasons in its favor, reasons which I would like to discuss.

The most frequently quoted argument is that it is better to talk with Khrushchev than to fight a nuclear war with him. This is of course a *non sequitur*. In the first place, we are not necessarily faced

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with either alternative, as the President has maintained for four years.

Secondly, the question of the state visit to America should not be confused with the question of the feasibility or the necessity for negotiation. I would not object to a meeting between Eisenhower and Khrushchev under proper conditions. I recognize as fully as anyone the necessity for negotiations. But negotiations should never take place under conditions that imply concessions under threat and approval of or indifference to Communist tyranny.

It is held that when Khrushchev comes here and tours this Nation, he cannot fail to be impressed by the size and strength of our country and the determination of our people to defend what we have.

I suspect that Khrushchev, like other Soviet visitors to this country, will see here only what he wants to see. I am sure that he will not be impressed by tours of a few military bases or scientific establishments even if he agrees to visit them. He is too used to staging guided tours and demonstrations of strength in Red Square to be impressed by them here.

We know that the Kremlin maintains constant surveillance of our magazines, newspapers, scientific journals and statistical publications. Khrushchev has at his fingertips exact information as to the capacity of our economy, the state of our scientific progress and the status of our military strength.

He may be impressed not by the attractive features of our society but by the absence of an effective civil defense program, by the absence of discipline, by the absence of dedication and sacrifice.

IT IS OFTEN SAID that the free world can only gain from exchanges of this kind with the Communists and that if the price for having our President visit the Soviet Union is to have Khrushchev here, then the benefit is well worth the cost.

I dispute this. The Communist system is fully able to control any impressions that American visitors might make there. Any momentary personal triumphs which one or another of our representatives might score in various spots of the Soviet Union can be easily isolated and a variety of propaganda can be let loose to distort the words and actions of our visitors. The obstacles which were placed in Vice President Nixon's path, the planted hecklers, the distortions and misrepresentations of his words and acts prove this.

Four decades of Communist tyranny and propaganda have cowed the peoples of the Soviet Union, reduced them to fearfulness and docility and robbed them to a great extent of the capacity for independent thinking. And above and beyond this, the actions of the Soviet Government are not governed by the moods or wishes of the people.

Everything is reversed in the United States. There is no attempt to control or distort the news accorded Communist visitors and there is no means to do so even if there were the will. These visitors are great novelties; they have tremendous news value and they are given every opportunity to make exactly the kind of impression they want to make. Their attempts to disarm the American people, to disguise Communist motives, to erode away our moral indignation against communism are carried out under ideal circumstances.

Their visitors, their exhibits are calculated to weaken the basic resistance of the American people to communism. The greater their success, the greater likelihood that more and more Americans will cease thinking of communism as a dread, monstrous tyranny which seeks to destroy all that we stand for and begin to think of it as just another way of life that differs somewhat from our own but which has its own good points.

The further this false doctrine spreads in this country, the stronger will be the clamor for foolhardy unilateral disarmament, the greater will be the resistance to continuing sacrifices to maintain our strength, and the easier will be the path of Communist infiltration and subversion.

An adequate national response to the challenge of world communism is impossible without a recognition of what it is:

Communism is total evil. It is all black. There is nothing gray about it. There is nothing good about it. Its ends and its means to those ends are evil.

If, by force of circumstances, Communists are for something right, it is only as an expedient to advance their evil ends.

If they occasionally appear in a worthy light, it is because they must make some appeal to human needs and aspirations.

When they educate the ignorant, it is to perfect their apparatus of enslavement.

When they industrialize, it is to strengthen their capacity for aggression.

When they talk peace, it is just another means of waging war.

When they allow long overdue improvements in living conditions, it is evidence that even Communist oppressors must make some concessions to the wishes of the oppressed.

There is no evil so appalling that Communists would shrink from it, if it would effectively advance their ends. There is no atrocity so hideous that they would not willingly commit it if it served their purposes.

There are those who say that after Khrushchev

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

comes here, he may be convinced of the true desire of the American people and its Government for peace in the world. Does anyone seriously contend that the tensions in the world are caused by Khrushchev's honest doubt that America seeks peace?

If the long record of our deeds throughout the six decades of Khrushchev's life has not convinced him of the desire of the American people for peace, then I am sure that no two-week visit will do so. We do not have to prove our peaceful intentions.

What we must avoid, rather, is the mistaken estimate by Khrushchev that the American people are so peace-loving they will refuse to fight for Berlin or for other free world territory and are prepared to surrender piecemeal rather than stand up against Communist aggression. Khrushchev knows the American people are peace-loving. He is counting on that as one of the elements of weakness in the western camp. There is no need to bring him here to find out what he already knows. There is no need to encourage him to demand further concessions that the American people must not grant.

For all these reasons, I am raising my voice against the invitation to this infamous Red dictator to ply his wares on American soil.

The Governments of Norway and Sweden recently invited Khrushchev to visit their countries. To Moscow, these little nations so close to Soviet Russia, so relatively defenseless against Communist might, with their long tradition of neutrality, must have appeared inviting targets for Khrushchev's softening up policy. Yet a wave of public opposition to Khrushchev's visit swept these countries. The opposition was spearheaded by churchmen, prominent intellectuals, Nobel prize winners, university professors, writers and student organizations. When it became obvious that Khrushchev's Scandinavian visit would result in a propaganda defeat instead of the expected victory, he abruptly called off the trip.

I FEEL ever more strongly an unavoidable conviction that the Government and people of our country are not measuring up to the challenge of our age.

If our failure to meet these challenges continues, the eventual result will be defeat. But we hasten the day of that defeat when we go beyond failure to do the right thing and begin again to do wrong things.

Bringing Khrushchev to this country is a dreadful wrong.

It is bound to hurt us and the causes we represent. In the interest of salvaging something from this debacle, in the hope of limiting the harm wherever possible, I offer the following recommendations:

First, the President should take up with Khrushchev the issue of the captive nations, pointing out to him that the American people will regard further agreements as meaningless until there is evidence that the Soviet Government intends to respect its past agreements.

Second, our Government should insist on a clear-cut retraction of Khrushchev's Berlin ultimatum before we engage in further negotiations.

Third, all of the concessions offered by the West at the Geneva Foreign Ministers' Conference in the hope of obtaining an agreement should be considered null and void since the conference ended without agreement. Any future negotiations should have a fresh start.

Fourth, wherever possible, every attempt must be made by leaders of both parties who come into contact with Khrushchev to emphasize our firm resolve never to abandon the people of West Berlin.

Fifth, the American representatives and people who will meet Khrushchev during this tour should understand that their actions will be watched everywhere in the world and will have an effect on the outcome of the cold war. Khrushchev must be accorded no ovations in the citadel of freedom. The conduct of the American people should be governed by restraint and dignity. It would be wrong for our Government to ask our people to pretend to an enthusiasm which violates their religious beliefs and political convictions.

Sixth, those officials who are charged with planning Khrushchev's visit should draw a clear distinction between Khrushchev and between the legitimate leaders of free nations whom we have welcomed to our shores.

I hope that during Khrushchev's visit we shall hear church bells in the land, tolling their remembrance for the murdered millions behind the Iron Curtain. I hope that there will be public observances of prayer for the deliverance of the captive nations. I hope there will be peaceful demonstrations of our dedication to that true peace which can only be achieved by spreading freedom and justice throughout the earth.

Let there be no cheers for the Red dictator, no crowds assembled to greet him, no flattery or flowers. Let our people be civil but silent.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me ..... reprints of "THE DANGER OF PLAYING HOST TO KHRUSHCHEV" at $.....

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately—at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED